UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,368	04/19/2006	Terumasa Miyahara	126784	7426
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 10/22/2007 RIDGE, PLC	EXAM	EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 320850			RACHUBA, MAURINA T	
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22320-4850		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			3723	
		•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

· i		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/576,368	MIYAHARA ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Maurina Rachuba	3723	
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication aport Reply	opears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
WHIC - Exte afte - If NO - Faild Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING DEPOSITION OF	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION. 136(a). In no event, however, may a strict will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AI	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1\\\\ \in \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 A	August 2007		
2a)∏				
	,—	is action is non-final.		
<u>ا</u> رد	Since this application is in condition for allows			S IS
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.L	7. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposit	ion of Claims		•	
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application	n.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-6,8-16,18 and 19</u>	is/are withdrawn from cons	ideration.	
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) 7 and 17 is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
	The specification is objected to by the Examin			
	-		stad to but the Evenines	
لطارف	The drawing(s) filed on 19 April 2006 is/are: a		•	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			0441
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The nath or declaration is objected to by the			
' ' '	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached	I Office Action of form P1O-152	<b>4.</b>
Priority I	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)		ata haya haan raasiyad		
			mulination Nto	
			<del></del>	
			received in this National Stage	
* (	application from the International Burea	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	rapaired	
	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	cor me cermieu copies not	I ECCIVEU.	
A44	.4/_\			
Attachmer 1\⊠ Notic		Δ. · · · · · ·	N	
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
3) 🔀 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of I	nformal Patent Application	
Pape	er No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/9/07 7/24/07</u>	6)	·	

Application/Control Number: 10/576,368

**Art Unit: 3723** 

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

## **Election/Restrictions**

- 1. Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18 and 19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 13 August 2007.
- 2. Applicant's election with traverse of group II, species 2b in the reply filed on 13 August 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no lack of unity in accordance with PCT restriction practice. This is not found persuasive because at the least the species defined by claims dependent on generic claim 7 do not share the same technological features. For example, claim 16 limits the connecting structure to claws, while claim 17 limits the connecting structure to magnets. There is no disclosure of a connecting structure of claws and magnets. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL. Note that on allowance of a generic or linking claim, all the claims dependent from that claim will be examined. It is strongly suggested that applicant not file any divisional applications until such determination of patentability can be made.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 3723

4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. It appears from the specification that it is the polishing body 815 that is connected to the second body holding unit by magnets, and not the second carrier connected to the first carrier as claimed. See the specification, page 17. There is no support for the first and second holding units to be connected by magnets.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sato et al, 6,312,320. Please refer to figures 3- 7, and their descriptions.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3723

- 8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al, 6,312,320 in view of Senga et al, 6,520,895. '320 does not disclose that the second holding unit is magnetically connected to the first holding unit. It is the examiner's position that the use of magnets to provide a temporary connection between two bodies is old and well known, as taught by '895, column 4, lines 55 through column 5, lines 14. As both the references teach apparatus for providing a connection between two bodies (see '320, figure 3, for example screw 24 holding 55 to carrier 35a), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute one connecting device for the other to achieve the predictable result of providing a connection between two bodies that is easily disconnected.

#### Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Other similar devices are cited of interest.

Application/Control Number: 10/576,368

Art Unit: 3723

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurina Rachuba whose telephone number is 571 272 4493. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571 272 4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> /M. Rachuba/ **Primary Examiner** Art Unit 3723